

FILED

FEB 15 2006

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RICHARD M. FELDMAN, an individual;
et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

FRAN MAINELLA, in her official
capacity as the Director of the National
Park Service; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 05-56581

D.C. No. CV-05-04900-DT

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dickran M. Tevrizian, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 13, 2006^{**}

Before: FERNANDEZ, RYMER, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument and therefore denies appellants' request for oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

This preliminary injunction appeal comes to us for review under Ninth Circuit Rule 3-3. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

We subject a district court's order regarding preliminary injunctive relief to only limited review. *Walczak v. EPL Prolong, Inc.*, 198 F.3d 725, 730 (9th Cir. 1999). Our review of an order regarding a preliminary injunction "is much more limited than review of an order involving a permanent injunction, where all conclusions of law are freely reviewable." *Id.* A decision regarding a preliminary injunction is reviewed for abuse of discretion, which occurs only if the district court based its decision on either an erroneous legal standard or clearly erroneous factual findings. *Id.*

The district court did not abuse its discretion here. *See Martin v. Int'l Olympic Comm.*, 740 F.2d 670, 674-75 (9th Cir. 1984). We therefore affirm the district court's order denying plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. Our disposition will affect the rights of the parties only until the district court renders final judgment. *Sports Form, Inc. v. United Press International*, 686 F.2d 750, 752 (9th Cir. 1982).

AFFIRMED.